

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1902.

Number 208.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

World-power patriotism is selfishness magnified.

And just as sure as selfishness reacts in the end disastrously upon the individual self-seeker, so, in the nature of things, must world-power patriotism react disastrously upon the country that fosters it. No country can long retain its own freedom after it goes in for foreign conquest. Imperial sway over distant colonies is the sure forerunner of imperial sway at home.

This assertion, so often made in the way of prophecy with reference to our own colonial ventures, is coming true even faster than could have been feared. For domestic imperialism is expressing itself in the new army bill. Gen. Miles has made this clear. He has made it so clear that even the dupes of the party in power—this party of conquest rampant and trusts triumphant—even the dupes of that party, though fools, may understand it if they will.

Gen. Miles became a witness last week before the Senate committee on military affairs, and as such was under examination by the committee on the subject of the army bill in question, which is now pending in Congress. To appreciate the full force of Gen. Miles's testimony, it must be remembered that this bill was prepared under the direction of the Secretary of War, and is understood to have the President's approval. Gen. Miles described the true character of the bill as a long step in the direction of creating a military despotism, not mere-

ly in the Philippines, but also here at home, when in testifying he said:

It is centralization of the most pronounced type; it augments the power of the staff, and in effect it removes it further from touch with the fighting force of the army. The scheme is revolutionary, casts to the winds the lessons of experience, and abandons methods which successfully carried us through the most memorable war epochs of our history. The proposed plan is but an effort to adopt and foster, in a republican form of government such as ours, a system peculiarly adapted to monarchies having immense standing armies. It would seem to Germanize and Russianize the small army of the United States. . . . It seems to me you are throwing the door wide open for a future autocrat or a military despot. It is not, in my judgment, in accordance with the principle and theory of democratic government, and for the best interests of the army, which has existed more than a hundred years and fulfilled all your requirements, to adopt such a scheme.

Because Gen. Miles gave this pointed testimony, the air is full of rumors (many of them vouched for by press correspondents known to be in good standing at the White House), to the effect that the President contemplates again subjecting Gen. Miles to severe discipline. He seems to regard this clearly privileged testimony as a personal reflection upon the witness' military superiors, which must be punished in true autocratic style. But the personal matter is really of no moment. It makes little difference whether or not Gen. Miles has hurt the feelings of President Roosevelt and his Secretary of War. It makes quite as little whether or not he was guilty of a breach of military discipline in telling the truth when testifying as a witness before a Senate committee. The important question is whether his characterization of the proposed army bill is correct. On that point it is to be observed that while there is much indignation in administration circles over his testi-

mony as a possible breach of discipline, there is no denial of its truth.

If it is a military duty to mislead Senate committees when testifying before them, a breach of which calls for discipline, the military witnesses before Senator Lodge's Philippine committee have conducted themselves on the whole with great military propriety. But in this case the witnesses were complying with the manifest desires of the majority of the committee. The infamy of American rule in the Philippines was to be whitewashed, and the majority of the committee—or, rather, Senator Lodge, for he virtually is the majority—is making a neat job of it.

When Senator Hoar moved for a special Senate committee on the conduct of the war in the Philippines, Mr. Lodge opposed the motion. He objected to having the matter taken out of his own hands as chairman of the standing committee on the Philippines. This was the first indication of the plan, now evident, to make a "whitewash" of the inquiry. And Mr. Hoar, in one of his intermittent fits of weakness, assented. Accordingly, the inquiry was referred to Mr. Lodge's committee.

Then came the next development. None of the minority members of Mr. Lodge's committee being equipped with a ready knowledge of details regarding the American occupation of the Philippines, no thorough cross-examination of Mr. Lodge's military witnesses was likely to be made. To overcome this unfortunate feature of the reference to a standing instead of a special committee, the services of a lawyer of high reputation, who is familiar with the details of the subject under investigation, were offered to the committee; but the majority, led by Mr. Lodge, declined the

offer. There is no reasonable explanation, other than that they wished to conceal rather than to discover the truth.

Another coat of "whitewash" was put on later. The committee had been appointed to initiate inquiries into a condition; but, controlled by the majority, which was in turn controlled by Mr. Lodge, it refused to take the initiative, and assumed to be a sort of court for the trial of issues. To all who suggested lines of inquiry leading apparently to evidence of gross maladministration, it replied in effect: "Bring on your witnesses." And there it stood, and there it stands. This is the policy it still pursues.

Lest, also, the public might learn too much from even the partisan witnesses it calls, witnesses who are themselves implicated in the suspected maladministration, Mr. Lodge's committee excludes all newspaper correspondents except the reporters who represent the three press monopolies of the country—men who are under the orders of monopolist papers. Thus we have a committee which is well organized at the outset for a "whitewash," which declines the aid of a lawyer specially and thoroughly equipped and of high standing, which refuses to investigate by probing impartially for the truth, and which takes care to exclude the public and independent correspondents from its hearings. If these circumstances do not justify the growing suspicion that Mr. Lodge has undertaken a "whitewashing" job it must be because he is another of the immaculates against whom no suspicion may be breathed, under the penalty of blasphemy and treason. If Mr. Lodge really desires to uncover the truth, if he is really willing to end the conspiracy of silence which from the beginning has characterized the Philippine policy, if there is nothing in that policy which the American people may not be allowed to know about, then let him give some earnest at least of his good faith by opening the hearings to the public and af-

fording newspaper facilities not only to the monopoly press associations, but to all news gatherers.

While Mr. Lodge's committee is sedulously engaged in suppressing the facts about the Philippines, the censor at Manilla has incautiously let out a piece of testimony before a court-martial which verifies one of the worst charges that have been made against the American troops in that long suffering archipelago. We refer to the charge that the Americans kill defeated Filipinos instead of taking them prisoners. This has been strenuously denied. And upon being proved in particular instances, the instances have been explained on the ground that the American troops could not always be restrained from retaliating upon the Filipinos for barbarities suffered by their comrades at the hands of Filipinos. But repeatedly the American people have been officially assured that these particular outrages were seldom perpetrated, and then not only without the authority but against the orders of responsible officers. As Secretary Root put it in his report to the Senate: *That the soldiers fighting such an enemy, and with their own eyes witnessing such deeds, should occasionally be regardless of their orders and retaliate by unjust severities is not incredible. . . . [but] . . . A constant and effective pressure of prohibition, precept and discipline has been maintained against them.*

Mr. Root's pronoun "them" related to tortures, but his explanation is typical of the excuses for killing instead of capturing, and of killing after capture. Now, however, thanks to a sleepy censor at Manila, we have positive evidence that this barbarous mode of warfare has been carried on under orders from general officers. It comes out in the trial of Maj. Waller, charged with murdering Filipinos in the island of Samar, and of whom in this connection the unsavory Funston said at a banquet in Chicago, "Bully for him; I am glad he did it!" In Waller's defense Capt. Porter, of the marine corps, who accompanied Waller in his ill-fated expedition into the

interior of the island of Samar, gave testimony on the 24th. The substance of Porter's testimony, as reported on the 25th by the Chicago Inter Ocean, a thick-and-thin Republican paper, is as follows:

Capt. Porter, of the marine corps, who accompanied Maj. Waller on the trip across Samar, continued his testimony. He said that Gen. Smith gave Maj. Waller power of life or death by inference, saying he wanted no prisoners, and that traitors should be punished by death.

Mr. Lodge has glibly offered to examine anonymous witnesses who have written about such barbarities, knowing full well that they could not reveal their identity without being persecuted. But here is a witness who is not anonymous. Capt. Porter is his name, and he says in words that Gen. Smith gave orders to his subordinates to take "no prisoners" but to kill "traitors." Will Senator Lodge bring Capt. Porter, Maj. Waller and Gen. Smith before his committee, and let the public hear them testify? or will he go on with his star chamber job at "whitewashing"?

When the river and harbor plunder bill came up for passage in the House, Congressman Sulzer demanded the yeas and nays, so as to put every member on record. But the spoils had been so judiciously distributed that only three other members supported Mr. Sulzer's demand. Consequently, the constitution making it necessary that one-fifth of the members present shall make the demand in order to give it effect, the yeas and nays were not recorded. When it comes to cutting up river and harbor "pork," most Democratic congressmen are very much like Republican congressmen—they take their share and say nothing.

The much-praised Republican bill to abolish "government by injunction" in the Federal courts has gone into a Republican committee of the Senate and come out with a proviso which not only nullifies the body of the bill but would actually legalize the very judicial innovation at the reversal of which the bill is professed-